श्री विक्रम वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश): महोदय, इन्कम टैक्स डिपार्टमेंट ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी (मध्य प्रदेश): महोदय, जब तक यह सब्स्टांसिव मोशन नहीं होता ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री विक्रम वर्मा : इन्कम टैक्स डिपार्टमेंट का मामला है ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी : यह राज्य का मामला है ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री विक्रम वर्मा : सारे कागज़ इन्कम टैक्स डिपार्टमेंट ने सीज़ किए हैं ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सुरेश पचौरी : सभापति महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सभापति : मैंने इजाजत नहीं दी है। हमने इजाजत नहीं दी है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री बलबीर के. पुंज (उत्तर प्रदेश) : जब उनको इजाजत दी है ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री सभापति : ठीक है, लेकिन अब आप इनको बोलने दीजिए, इनके अभी दस मिनट बीत गए हैं।

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

Security scenario in the light of Terrorist and other Internal and External Security Threats and the remedial measures taken by Government in this regard

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to the hon. Members who participated in yesterday's discussion. I do believe that it is one of the important discussions that the House has had. The Government has, no doubt, benefited from hearing the views of the hon. Members. Some 14 hon. Members participated in the discussion. A number of issues have come up; some of general nature; some of specific nature. It shall be my endeavour to cover as many issues as I can, and I shall continue to do so. I wish to assure the Members that when I am rising to reply here to the discussion, I do so, not simply as Minister of External Affairs and Defence, but also on behalf of my distinguished senior and colleague, the Home Minister. It is very gratifying, Sir, that 14 hon. Members participated in the debate. Of course, it is equally gratifying that all the 14

hon. Members must have, no doubt, studied the reports concerned fully; and they must have analysed it in its totality, on account of various comments that have been made as also suggestions that have come.

Sir, I wish to place on record that even though the discussion was not specifically on the Report of the Group of Ministers, the initiator of the discussion, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, referred to two reports; one is the Report of the Standing Committee on Home Affairs; and the other is the Group of Ministers' Report. He also then said that it would have been better if the Group of Ministers' Report had been tabled in the House. I have, no doubt, in my mind that the hon. Shri Pranab Mukherjee is fully aware that, ordinarily, reports of the Group of Ministers are, actually, not tabled in the House. That is number one. Number two; ordinarily, reports of the Group of Ministers are, actually, only for the internal consumption of the Cabinet. They are also not made public. The Government, however, on complete examination of the issues involved, determined -- that this was a Report of the Group of Ministers which was of sufficient importance -- to actually make it public so that there was a full discussion not only in Parliament, but also across the country, in the media and else where. It is with that intent, and that intent alone, that the Report of the Group of Ministers was placed in the Library of Parliament even before the Parliament had reconvened for the Monsoon Session.

Sir, this Group of Ministers' Report on reforming the national security system, I believe, has a special significance.

It is the first ever, in the last fifty-plus years, where a holistic review of the Indian national security system has taken place. Some hon. Members made a reference to the Kargil Review Committee's report. But unlike that report which was mandated merely to recommend measures necessary to safeguard national security against armed intrusion of the type that had taken place in the Kargil sector, the Group of Ministers was required to review the national security system in its entirety. Accordingly, the Group of Ministers focussed not only on external, but also on internal threats, particularly, the problem posed by insurgency, narco-terrorism, collapse of law and order machinery in some parts of India, Left-wing extremism, decline in the efficacy of Central Paramilitary Forces and State Police Forces, etc., which aspect was referred to by some hon. Members.

The extensive and wide-ranging nature of the Group of Ministers' work is established by the fact that the report that the Group of Ministers have submitted, makes about 340 recommendations covering intelligence, internal security, border management and management of defence.

Also, I wish to, particularly, highlight that these recommendations of the Group of Ministers are the result not of any cloistered in house exercise; they are the product of interactive process encouraged by the Group of Ministers, with the best available talent, both within and outside the Government. In order to facilitate the task, the Group of Ministers had set up four multi-disciplinary Task Forces, one each, for Intelligence, Internal security, Border management and management of Defence, comprising acknowledged experts in the field, most of them from outside the Government.

These recommendations were then debated within the system, between the concerned officials and the Chairmen of the Task Forces, in the presence of the Group of Ministers. It was only through this rigorous churning process, with the participation of all, that the Group of Ministers arrived at the recommendations, which are now contained in the report. I do wish, also, to place on record that this report was completed in the shortest possible time, about 10 months. The Group of Ministers was constituted on 17th April, 2000, and they submitted the report to the Prime Minister on 26th February, 2001. The Cabinet Committee on Security approved the Group of Ministers' report, with the exception of the recommendations pertaining to the office of Chief of Defence Staff, and this approval was jointed on 11th May, 2001. Therefore, for implementation, Sir, we are really talking of the period which starts from around middle of May this year, till now, which is roughly the end of August.

Sir, some broad issues that can be distilled from the participation by 14 hon. Members relate to internal order, to security in its totality, to adherence to law, to aspects of fundamentalism. There were also references, in great detail, by all the hon. Members to terrorism, its nexus with narcotics, with arms supply, its spread within the country, how terrorism is promoted, encouraged and abetted, not simply just financed, but in other respects too, by Pakistan. Now, this aspect of terrorism, we have discussed on several earlier occasions, in the context of the discussions that we had about Pakistan. I will, of course, say there is nothing specific in relation to terrorism that has come up, except that the

menace continues in the form of cross-border terrorism. The cross-border terrorism manifests itself, particularly, in the State of the Jammu and Kashmir, though terrorist activities occur in other parts of India. It is the assessment of the Government that most such terrorist activity is Pak-sponsored, Pak ISI-sponsored. The Government is seized of this issue and addresses this as a great responsibility. Sir, on the totality of the nuclear question, the origin, the concept, the doctrine, a suggestion was made that the May 1998 test resulted in the grant to Pakistan of a strategic equivalence, in terms of possession of weapons of mass destruction. No doubt, hon. Members recognise that within a fortnight, after the Pokhran tests, Pakistan was able to conduct tests in Chaggai Hills of Baluchistan. The tests that were conducted, were not conducted on sandy soil. They were conducted after test sites having been prepared well in advance and on a rock face, which has to be drilled, a horizontal drilling at that. Therefore, it was not possible that Pakistan acquired strategic equivalence on this account. What did certainly happen was that what was known almost a decade earlier as Pakistan's nuclear programme, its capability, which was implicit, thereafter, became explicit. It was not an accidental explicit that the Government desired in this regard. The Government wanted that the international community must recognise that Pakistan's nuclear programme, with international assistance, is, in fact, at a stage where all kinds of subterfuge, subterfuge of its denial, had no validity, and that was a part of the purpose. Sir, there were also, inevitably and naturally references made to Jammu and Kashmir, as also, to the law and order situation and a variety of other challenges to India in the North-Eastern States of India and also the question of internal sense of order of law. We recognise this; we recognise what is happening in Jammu and Kashmir, we also recognise fully what is happening in the North-Eastern part of India. It is indeed as a part of that recognition, that the hon. Members would accept that, for example, in the North-Eastern part of India, today, we do have a situation which is a consequence of the Naga peace talks wherein, notwithstanding, the recent difficulties that we have had in the State of Manipur, the fact remains that the Naga peace talks process is holding. There is a much larger constituency of peace, for peace in Nagaland. By and large, the civil society in Nagaland today fully supports the peace process and stands for peace. The greatest contributor to such a peace process, it is the Government view, is always the expansion of the constituency of peace in that part of the Union of India or whichever it might be. Unless the civil society becomes a contributor, a participant, in restoring peace, externally

aided and encouraged insurgency, terrorist activity, etc., will find fertile grounds in which it grows.That is the overall approach that we are pursuing. On Jammu and Kashmir, we have had a number of discussions because there are some specific and detailed queries that have arisen. I do not wish to take the time of the hon. Members in going into the details of the approach of the Government to the total question of Jammu and Kashmir. We have, repeatedly, discussed this issue in this House. Whenever, in future, the House wishes to discuss the situation in Jammu and Kashmir, the Government is willing to do so. To a particular query and a suggestion मेरे भाई मिर्ज़ा अब्दुल रशीद साहब ने फरमाया कि जम्मू-कश्मीर में कुछ कदम उठाने चाहिए, वज़ीरे-आज़म साहब ने वहां जाकर उनका ऐलान भी किया था और उससे क्रॉस-बॉर्डर टैररिज्म और LOC के आस-पास जो हरकतें होती हैं, उन पर पाबंदी लगेगी। मैं उनको भरोसा दिलाना चाहूंगा कि उन्होंने प्रधानमंत्री जी की जिस घोषणा का उल्लेख किया है, निश्चित रूप से हम उस पर दृढ़ हैं और मैं वज़ीरे-आज़म साहब से भी उसका जिक्र करूंगा। मुझे भरोसा है कि माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी ने अगर ऐसी कोई सार्वजनिक घोषणा की है तो सरकार उस दिशा में कदम उठाएगी और उस पर अमल भी करना चाहेगी। There was a very important point which my senior, distinguished colleague, who was earlier the Leader of the House, Shri Pranab Mukherjee made, which I would like to term as 'reactive legislation.' I think, Pranab Babu is entirely right. But we are all learners. We learn through the very experience of the democratic and legislative processes. Sir, Pranab Babu, particularly cited two examples of the whole question of application, philosophy, relevance, of Article 356, and how those very advocates for the abolition or reduction of the relevance of Article 356 were now saying, 'No. We need to look at it again.' Yes, Sir. This is a reality. This is a fact. I do not deny this. But this is not an infirmity. This, in fact, is a part of the process that all of us go through in the great endeavour of the democratic process. The Government, no doubt, as we are sitting, you were sitting, having gone through the experience of a very unhappy period of 1975-77 -- I do not want to dwell on it; it is part of the experience of a number of us here -- came to the conclusion that that period was an aberration and, therefore, some of the other things that were aspects of aberrant behaviour or demonstrations of aberrant behaviour of that period were also equally bad. It is a natural human tendency. It is not unnatural. I have no doubt in my mind that if any of you were ever to suffer from such indignities, the fact remains that, perhaps, you too would have then reacted in that fashion. A similar reaction was there and I appreciate what Pranab Babu has said; for example, in regard to TADA. Yes, Sir. I have had the honour of being in Parliament for six terms -- in both the Houses. I have also been a witness to, and greatly interested in, the

discussions that have taken place in regard to an Act that is necessary to contain, to address and to be able to confront, legally, with a proper instrument of law in the hands of the Government, when we are challenged, when the State of India is challenged, by an extraordinary challenge. I do not wish to dwell upon the challenge that the country today faces. Various terms are used for it -- proxy war, clandestine war, cross-border terrorism, terrorism, narco-terrorism, counterfeit currency. There are many aspects. When a democratic order, deeply subscribing, culturally, from our very insides, civilizationally, to all norms of human rights, when that society and that State is confronted by such a challenge, what should that State and that society do? It is that underlying problem that all of us have to collectively address. And, I do believe, Sir, that we need to re-examine the whole question whether the country requires such a legislation, such a piece of law, or not. I do not wish to repeat that the then Minister of State for Internal Security had -- a very distinguished Member of the ruling party, and I do not want to cite the name of the party -- in Parliament, said that the criminal law system in the country had collapsed. Now, I wish to say to you that it is part of the living experience of a number of us here, who had then seen, in the decade of the eighties, whether it was in Assam or Jammu & Kashmir or Punjab, what was happening? Law courts and justices of courts were simply refusing to even address issues like trying known terrorists. I do not wish to dwell on that. But this is a reality; by the grace of God Almighty, we do not have such a situation. The courts of law are addressing themselves purposefully. When confronted by a challenge of this nature, the challenge that we face -- as a State, as a civil society, and as a Government -- and confronted by this kind of an activity, which is publicly denied, privately supported, and day after day it continues, we know the dimensions of it. I do believe that the Government requires such a law. And, that, I think, lies at the root of my distinguished colleague, the Home Minister's announcement that the Government requires some such law. In that regard, I welcome greatly what hon. Pranab Mukherjee has said that we should re-examine the whole question. Well, you could say. But a number of us, here, and myself know, how in Punjab, for example, during that period of 1975-77, day after day, *Akali Jatthas* were being arrested. And, again, in the eighties, my friends from Punjab, what they went through in Punjab, and what Punjab went through; what my friends from Jammu & Kashmir are now going through; what my friends from the North-East face on a daily basis;, what are we to do in this regard? I think, collectively, we have to sit together, legislatively, legally, and arm the State with such

powers, such reasonable powers, as we feel are needed for the purpose. This is an aspect of what I call, the process of learning in a democracy. We have all learnt. I welcome very much what the hon. Pranab Mukherjee ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL : Please permit me just for a minute. Sir, in fact, our experience with respect to Jammu and Kashmir and Punjab, and the rest of the country, in the context of TADA, has been that the two States, namely, Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir, where TADA was necessary and should have been used, was not used, and in the States where it should not have been used, it was used. In fact, our experience is to the contrary, that when you have laws of this nature, they are used in areas where they are not necessary; and in areas where they are necessary, they cannot be used because of the very nature of the insurgency.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No, I don't dispute that point, Sir, but I am not going into the totality of the use or misuse or what was available to the State as a legal instrument, etc. That is altogether a different inquiry. And, no doubt, it was part of the recognition of that infirmity that persuaded the earlier Parliaments, of which I too was a Member, to say "no; this is being disemployed". And, if it is being disemployed, the only correction is not to have such a legislation. So, when we think of it, we can think only in terms of proper application of law because -- I do not wish to enter into a long disputation, it would be a legalistic disputation -- that is the essence of philosophy. Sir, the challenges of tomorrow are inherent in an examination of today's security environment. When we look at tomorrow's challenges, we are looking at the sheer velocity of technological advancement, miniaturisation of micro-technologies, of newer technologies, a whole revolution in military affairs, at the nature of war that has changed. That a country will overrun another, conquer and subjugate the population of that country is a thing of yesterday. Today, we face, in the shape of war, a challenge of proxy and clandestine terrorist activities. This is another manifestation, and we need to address it in that form. Then, I have with me, in figurative terms, the recommendations made by the Group of Ministers. I share with the hon. Members that, roughly, 340 recommendations were made, of which, so far as the intelligence apparatus is concerned, 16 recommendations have already been implemented; 11 will be completed by December, 2001; 5 will require further action, because it is an intelligence apparatus, because it is elaborate, and will be completed, latest, by the middle of next year; and, around 9 will take some more time. Similarly, on

internal security, out of 94, 28 recommendations have been implemented. I believe that, actually, about 50 will be completed before this year is out. Another 30-odd will be implemented before half the next year is over. Similarly, for border management, about 50% of the recommended steps have already been completed or will be completed before this year is out. So far as the defence management is concerned, out of 75, 69 steps have already been or will be completed before this year is out. So, you will find that out of 340 odd steps, 230-odd -- I was also part of the Group of Ministers who made these recommendations and am also part of the implementing machinery --are likely to be completed before this year is out, and about 300 will be completed before half the next year is gone. So, this is not an unsatisfactory situation. I do not wish to go into the details of the recommendations that are contained in the report itself because I started by saying "I have no doubt in my mind that all the hon. Members who have participated, have examined that report, in detail; and all the details are already there. Some queries were raised. Now, I would like to deal with the aspect of internal and external security. Sir, particularly, some comments were made in regard to the Ministry of External Affairs. There was a suggestion made here by the hon. Member that the Defence Forces -- that is the phrase used -- are 'porous'. This is a very blanket condemnation. I appeal to all the hon. Members, the calling of the Armed Forces is an hon'ble calling; wearing of the uniform is an hon. distinction that a citizen, whether a man or a woman, can have. So, in totality, to say that the Defence Forces are porous is very unfair. Yes; some shortcomings had been recognised and those shortcomings are being addressed. But even as those shortcomings are addressed, I do appeal to all hon. Members 'please, from this high pedestal of Parliament, do not say that the Armed Forces are, porous. The Armed Forces cannot stand up and answer. But, as the Minister of Defence, it becomes my bounden duty to stand up on behalf on the Armed Forces, to stand up for the Armed Forces, and say, 'the aberrants are not the totality of the uniformed services.' Mistakes that are made, found; identified are punished in accordance with the laws that are there, whether it is the Army Act, the Air Force Act or the Navy Act. The application of that law in relation to an activity, whether it is commercial espionage or any kind of misdemeanour, is quick and, is, by and large, entirely satisfactory. It is in that context, Sir, that I wish to say that a suggestion was also made that decision-making in the Ministry of Defence has come to a stand-still: I refute that imputation; I refute that suggestion. To suggest that the decision-making in the Ministry of Defence has come to

a stand-still is to suggest that defence preparedness of the country, the combat effectiveness of the Armed Forces, is somehow being permitted to occur on account of any kind of indecision on the part of the Government. It is a very wrong notion. It is true, Sir, that the Ministry of Defence has, up till lately, had five simultaneous inquiries being conducted. There is, of course, the Venkatswamy Commission; we had Courts of Inquiry on Army officers and others who were identified in the dotcom matter. Sir, there was a Court of Inquiry; there is the Venkatswamy Commission; there was the internal inquiry that the Ministry of Defence had ordered about such civilian personnel of the Ministry of Defence who were required to be investigated; plus the Central Vigilance Commission is looking into it, plus the Comptroller and Auditor General is also looking into it. Notwithstanding the fact that five simultaneous inquiries were there in the Ministry of Defence, not for a single day was any important decision in regard to the Ministry of Defence permitted to wait even 24 hours. I say this, Sir, with a sense of responsibility, with no sense of braggadocio. And, I say, it is because the hon. Prime Minister had entrusted me with these responsibilities. A comment was made, Sir, that I am part-time. Yes Sir, I am part-time; and, as soon as the Prime Minister decides that now is the time to have this portfolio handled by somebody else, he will take the decision, he will take it in due course of time. It is not for me to then offer arguments of the nature that I am offering now. It has also been our experience that in one of the previous Governments, of which the present Leader of the Opposition was a distinguished member, for almost five years, there was no Defence Minister. The Prime Minister was handling the portfolio of Defence also. Would it be said that because the then Prime Minister was handling the portfolio of Defence, the Defence Ministry at that time was a subservient Ministry? The then Prime Minister, in his wisdom, had chosen that he would, in addition to being the Prime Minister, also handle the Defence portfolio. Yes, we had such occasions, but nevertheless, to impute, because, now, I have the honour to simultaneously have the Defence responsibility, I am somehow deficient and the Ministry of Defence is somehow being crippled, is not proper. That any previous example of this nature was, in fact, an example worthy of emulation. I would reject such an allegation.

Sir, there was also a suggestion made that the Army was acquiring sub-standard equipment. This is too blanket a suggestion to make. There

was a suggestion made that the Forces, particularly, in Jammu and Kashmir, are suffering on account of the sub-standard night-vision devices or thermal imaging devices. This is not borne out by facts. I say it on the basis of the authority I hold and the knowledge that I acquired in the process.

There was another allegation in relation to Defence. Defence expenditure figures were cited to show that this Government has been negligent on defence, because as a percentage of GDP, the Defence expenditure had fallen during this Government's period. Sir, I am not talking of the volume of the expenditure or the total quantum of the expenditure, as a percentage of GDP, because, my hon. colleague, Mr. Virumbi has already cited figures, in percentage terms. Therefore, I would not take the time of the House by repeating what he has already said. But I did conduct an exercise of cutting out an average of the defence expenditure in the years from 1991-92 to 1995-96, when the average expenditure during those five years varied like this. It was 2.5, 2.35, 2.54, 2.3 and 2.26. The average comes to 2.39 or 2.4. The average from 1998-99 to 2001-02 Budget estimates was 2.27, 2.41, 2.50, 2.53, and then it comes to 2.42. I am not here to lobby figures as an advocacy of my defence preparedness. But I do point out that it is only in the heat of the discussion that the hon. Members wish to score a debating point against me, because I am in the Government and they are in the Opposition, and they have the full freedom to do that. But, Sir, this is my personal belief that when it comes to sensitive aspects like the country's security, to attempt to have an opinion not tempered against the litmus test of facts is not proper. Hon. Members are, of course, free to deduce what opinion they would like to deduce out of these facts.

The next question again related to the Defence Budget. It was alleged that about 70 per cent of the Budget of the Ministry of Defence goes for payment of salaries, leaving nothing for capital expenditure. This, again is factually incorrect. The Pay and Allowances, as a percentage of net Defence expenditure, are like this. I do not wish to go into earlier years, because I am not here to score debating points. In 1997-98, the percentage which went into pay and allowances was 37.8. It is an expenditure on a large standing Force. In 1998-99, it was 38.64; in 1999-2000, it was 35.26; in 2000-01, it was 33.45, and in 2001-02, it was 31.07. Of the total Defence expenditure, how much is the capital outlay? Because this capital outlay is really part of the money that goes for procurement of

weapon systems. In 1998-99, it was 25.15 per cent; in 1999-2000, it was 25.18 per cent; in 2000-2001, it was 27.14 per cent; in 2001-2002, which is the current year, it is 32.19 per cent. That is almost a third of the Defence expenditure, which is actually towards the capital expenditure. These are facts.

There was another question about the strategic command; that the Government has been laggard about the establishment of the strategic command. I have just given the broad break-up of the steps taken on the strategic command. I wish to make clear that in accordance with the recommendations of the Group of Ministers, the Cabinet Committee on Security has already approved the creation of a Joint Strategic Forces Command. The creation of this Command is on the basis of the nuclear doctrine, as stated by the Prime Minister in Parliament, No first use, minimum credible deterrence, and a structure consisting of the total requirements of the country's nuclear weapon system. The outline structure for such a Command, including the higher political element, as also the military command, and the control supporting structure has already been defined. At the moment, it will not be possible for me to go into any further details in this regard.

A question was raised regarding the Andaman and Nicobar Island Command. Now, yet again, let me clarify the position on the Andaman and Nicobar Island Command. Here I do not wish to again engage at scoring any debating points. When the Group of Ministers addressed itself to border management, we found -- this is, please, not a comment on any of my predecessors or any predecessor Governments -- that in the last 50 years, the question of India's island territories had never been addressed. In fact, it was difficult for us to establish, what was the total number of island territories that India possessed, what was the system that we were following, what security apparatus was in existence. This has not been done for the past 50 years. We have addressed this question. If the hon. Members go through the recommendations of the Group of Ministers, they will find this question addressed in great detail. That is why the question of the Andaman and Nicobar Island Command came up. The Cabinet Committee on Security has already approved the recommendations in this regard. It has approved the creation of a Joint Andaman and Nicobar Island Command. The structure of this first joint command has already been defined. All Forces of the Army, the Navy and the Air Force and the Coast Guard will operate under the command of the Andaman and Nicobar Island Commander. The Andaman and Nicobar Island Commander will hold the

rank of a CiC, Commander-in-Chief, as is the case with the other Regional Commanders of the Armed Forces. The headquarters staff of this Command will include officers from all the three services and also the Coast Guard. The first Commander of the Andaman and Nicobar Island Command shall be from the Navy; and, thereafter, it could be tenable by a suitable officer from any of the three Armed Forces. What this involves is, the creation of some new posts. Because it involves the creation of some new posts, I have to take this back to the CCS and the Cabinet because approval of new posts, any additional posts, requires a Cabinet approval.

I am very hopeful, Sir, that this Command will be established progressively from the end of September, that is, the end of next month and it will be in position in Andaman from next month onwards. That is the time-frame on which I am working.

A question was put about the integration of headquarters. It was cited that my friend and distinguished predecessor, as Minister of Defence, had said that by February, we will have it, an integrated structure, in position. The Group of Ministers' recommendations came in. It was decided that until the Group of Ministers' recommendations were received, it should not be done. They have been received. And the integration of service headquarters, along with the Ministry of Defence, has already begun, the necessary approval of the Cabinet granted. This is on a no-cost basis. As those hon. Members who had been distinguished civil servants would know, this requires certain amendments in the rules of procedure. That is already under the attention of the Cabinet Secretary. I expect that this, too, shall complete before the end of next month.

On the Chief of Defence Staff, this is the one recommendation on defence management about which we thought it would be better if it goes through a larger process of consultation because many distinguished Members, including some from the principal Opposition Party, privately met the hon. Prime Minister and expressed the opinion that this requires further discussion. I had hoped that during this discussion yesterday, the hon. Members would dwell at some length on the question of the Chief of Defence Staff and its desirability or share what their views in this regard were. It is a matter of regret to me that not enough time was spent on this question. But, nevertheless, the recommendation of the Group of Ministers stands and the hon. Prime Minister will engage himself in consultation as he deems fit.

1.00 P.M.

A point was raised that the Procurement Board and the system of procurement of complex weapon systems in the Ministry of Defence is time-consuming and is not a fact of efficiency. I accept that. That is why the Ministry of Defence has already completed the exercise for the establishment of a totally revamped Procurement Board. I might share with the hon. Members that as per the earlier system--I do not want to go into the vintage of it, which year it was established--the procurement of any weapon system required the taking of 32 steps. Any weapon system, small or big, complex or simple, procured by the Ministry of Defence required 32 steps be completed. Those 32 steps inevitably resulted in great time delays and the consequences, every one should be able to see. We have reformed all that. The new Procurement Board, the rules for it, have all been finalised. I intend, and I have already informed the hon. Prime Minister that as soon as it receives the final stamp of approval--yet again, I hope to do it within the next 15 days--I shall put the procurement systems, the structure of the Procurement Board, the systems that have to be followed, the composition of the Procurement Board, on the Defence Ministry web-site. It will be open to all so that whenever any weapon system is acquired, thereafter, it will be open to anybody to say 'this has not been done'," this requires to be done'.

We are also re-addressing the total question of the relevance or otherwise of this whole factor of agents in the procurement of weapon systems. And this too is in its final stages. Once this is done, these two shall be open on a website available to anybody for information; the Ministry of Defence has nothing to hide in this regard.

There were some specific queries raised, Sir. A figure was cited that the Government or the country simply did not have the money to acquire x, y or z weapon system, and in that context what was cited was the acquisition of T-90 tanks. Reference was made to Sukhoi, Mirage, AJT and Light Combat Aircraft. Reference in that context was also made to the Navy's proposed procurement of some weapon system. Let me place clearly and unambiguously the facts on all these. First, Sir, on the T-90 tank--I am not going into the history of the decision of T-90 tank, when it was taken, the relevance of the acquisition of such a weapon system,--what was cited was a quotation from a particular Russian website; I do not know whether it is a website which purports to conveying news or whether it is a news-item website. ...*(Interruption)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is 1 o'clock now; we will continue till it is finished.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will not take long, Sir. I am coming to the end of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whatever time you may take.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: So, on T-90, I wish to assure all the hon. Members that the figure cited by the hon. Member is not what the figure of procurement is. The total cost of acquiring--the hon. Member will forgive me if I do not cite the exact number of armoured-fighting vehicles that we shall be acquiring--the required number of armoured-fighting vehicles, along with transfer of technology, also with missiles, today--and this is what it has been contracted for--is around Rs.4,800 crores, and this is not one year's expenditure. This is an expenditure that is spread over a certain time.

A suggestion has been made that the Government is going into its acquisition whereas a certain website in Russia is saying that the factory is non-functional. I would like to disabuse impression of the hon. Member in this regard. When I went to Moscow recently, which was in May, not so long back, the Deputy Chief of Army Staff, whom I had requested to accompany me, along with the officer who was deputed to visit the said factory, which he did in June, it was clear, Sir, that the production was as per schedule. The first lot of these tanks would arrive in India, as contracted for, by the middle of December, this year; the delivery of the remaining--and I am not deliberately going into the figure--would be completed by the middle of next year. The delivery of the remaining would be completed by March, 2003. This is also an assurance, Sir, because when I went to Moscow, I had occasion to call on His Excellency, the President of Moscow, as also to meet my distinguished counterpart, the Defence Minister of Russia, Sergei Ivanov, and also the person who is dealing with it, more particularly, weapons supply etc., His Excellency, Mr. Klabenov, each of them, not simply in regard to T-90, had assured, reconfirmed, and then affirmed that Russia had, with India, a strategic partnership. None of these difficulties that are cited here or put out by whosover, by whichever website in Moscow, is, in fact, tenable. The word of the President, the Defence Minister, the security personnel, His Excellencey Mr. Klabenov, and my own Military Establishment, the Defence Attache, the Deputy Chief of Army Staff, is there. ...*(Interruptions)*...

We have officers, who were there on the site, in the factory now. Therefore, for the hon. Members to say that the Ministry of Defence is wrong because a certain website in Russia has put something across, is incorrect. I think we need to exercise some restraint in this regard. I take this opportunity to say that very recently, for example, a news item came across that some official of the MiG factory had stated that the reason for the incidents of accidents that had happened was that India purchased defective spare parts. This is factually incorrect. This kind of a comment is born of the commercial competition that takes place between Ukraine, which was part of the USSR, and Russia. A great deal of manufacturing facilities are established in Ukraine. Many of them may be made in Ukraine. Russia finds that Ukraine is a competitor in the supply of weapons. This kind of a statement is an irresponsible statement and, in fact, has been taken up by our officials in Moscow. It is also factually not correct. We do not go to the original manufacturer, that is, the MiG, unless we find that there has been a structural defect or deficiency in any of the aircraft. In the last 30 years, when this piece of equipment has been with us, there have been a very few occasions when we had to go back to them. As far as spare parts are concerned, let me assure you that, in fact, almost 90% of the spare parts of MiG variety are manufactured in India, between the various defence establishments and the HAL. The statement made by the MiG official is, factually, incorrect.

There was a question about Sukhoi, that Sukhoi will cost us a lot of money, etc. I am not going into those figures. Please understand that the acquisition of Sukhoi is spread over three Defence Five-Year Plans, that is, the Tenth, the Eleventh and the Twelfth Five-Year Plans. It is a fifteen-year schedule. It is not simply the acquisition. It also includes the manufacture of Sukhoi in India. It is spread over three Five-Year Plans. Therefore, the hon. Members' suggestion that because there is no money, the Government is acting irresponsibly, is not correct. I again request the hon. Members, with due regard to the views that the hon. Members hold, please temper your comments with reason.

So also is the case with Mirage. Mirage is a Tenth Five-Year Plan acquisition. In the case of Mirage, the due instalments, which are called stage payments, have already been made. There has been no default on any stage payments. There will be no default because it is a payment that is scheduled over the Tenth Five-Year Plan, and the full resource allocation has been made. Should I point out that we have had the Defence Five-

Year Plan, and the previous Government cleared the Plan, without any financial allocation to that particular Plan? My gallant colleague, Gen. Roy Chowdhury, is nodding his head in agreement. I don't go into that.

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY (West Bengal) : It is out of a bitter experience.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: He says, "It is out of a bitter experience". He had also gone through that. I have not cited. The country has to manage the totality of all this. To charge the Government, therefore, of dereliction of duty, so also the indignity, is completely uncalled for. It was suggested that we had an acquisition programme for the Navy, that is, Admiral Gorshkov. The contract for Admiral Gorshkov and its detailed negotiation has not yet been entered into. An hon. Member stands and informs the House that we will not be in a position to pay for Admiral Gorshkov. It was suggested, as if the contract had been arrived at, the detailed negotiations had taken place, but the monetary allocation had not taken place. It is, in fact, running totally against the facts.

A question was raised about self-reliance. Self-reliance is firstly not any achievement of this or any one Government alone. Self-reliance in defence preparedness is a long haul. I would like to pay tribute to the fact that when first conceived of, the establishment of the Defence Research Development Organisation, despite the mistakes and errors, -- and when you have a defence research establishment, stumbles do take place in such a research establishment -- is one of the most significant contribution to defence self-reliance. I would just like to cite the achievements of self-reliance. We have the 5.56 rifles, Dopler Radars, MBT, Arjun, pilotless aircraft, Prithvi-1 and Prithvi-2 missiles which are now part of the Ministry of Defence. I am not going into other integrated missile development achievements. Electronic warfare for Air Force, Sonars, BNP-2 variants, combat engineering equipment, including bridge-laying equipments, etc. are there. The accumulated value projection of indigenous design and development efforts for the three services as of the year 2000 is Rs. 11,000 crores. It is not an unsatisfactory figure. It is clearly proved that self-reliance is not a question of whether we can do without self-reliance. But it will be far more proper to say whether we can do without self-reliance. It is just a factual error about the Ministry of External Affairs...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal) : You have not spoken about AJTs.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Some questions have also been raised in this regard. We had a meeting of the Consultative Committee. So far as the question of AJT is concerned, the Price Negotiating Committee has been entrusted with this task. It is not the Government that negotiates the price. If the Government or the Ministry of Defence ever undertake to start negotiating the price, we will, in fact, be perverting the very system of the Price Negotiating Committee. The Price Negotiating Committee has not been able to arrive at a price that should be offered. That is one part of it. The other part is that we are currently faced with a situation where a single-vendor syndrome has appeared. Whenever there is a single-vendor syndrome, hon. Members would recognise that it would be highly unwise to be dictated on price terms by that single-vendor. I am ready to have a discussion, if the hon. Members so desire. It is a fact that in Advance Jet Trainers, training is needed for stage-three. It was never asserted that the accidents took place on account of the absence of stage-three training. I think tomorrow a question is coming on this very subject. There was a question last Thursday in this House and there was a question in this regard in the Lok Sabha also. I have answered these questions. If the hon. Members would go through the replies that I have given, which are on the record of Parliament, they will find that the Government has not neglected the question of AJT at all. In fact, it is this Government which has established the Price Negotiating Committee. It is this Government that has consistently pushed that the Price Negotiating Committee address itself to this responsibility with a sense of urgency. That was not done earlier. The requirement of an AJT was identified in the 1980s. From the 80s up till 1999, the Price Negotiating Committee was not established.

We established a Price Negotiating Committee; we entrusted it with the task of doing so. It has not yet been able to arrive at an answer. In the absence of the PNC arriving at an answer, I will find it difficult to affirm, particularly, when there is a single vendor, that this is the equipment that must be purchased...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: The only point is whether you will be able to indicate some kind of a time frame. Nobody is linking these accidents with the non-availability of AJT. But, anyway, it is a cause for concern for the whole nation. Since you are going into elaborate details about different prices of ammunitions, I asked this.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is, entirely, that the time-frame within which I am operating depends on the ability of the Price Negotiating Committee, given the situation of a single vendor, to come up to the Government and say that this is our recommendation. I am constantly in touch with the Defence Secretary as also the Chief of Air Staff. They too cannot interfere with the Price Negotiating Committee's functioning. Sir, the Price Negotiating Committee comprise not just of the servicemen, but it does have other technical representatives too. Therefore, this is the only time frame that I can give.

Sir, while some suggestions were made, it was pointed out that we are Pak-centred. The suggestions in relation to the Ministry of External Affairs run counter to facts; when they say that we are Pak-centred in reacting, that we haven't done anything regional, the hon. Members forget about the relationship that we have established, be it with Myanmar or the Mekong-Ganga Group of Countries or the opening of the land route with Myanmar or the relation with Bhutan, or with the movement that we have made with Nepal, or with the opening of the land routes, both road and rail, with Bangladesh, or also the relations with Iran, the visits that have taken place, or the security dialogue that Iran has initiated with us. Also about the People's Republic of China, it is a fact that the LAC clarification that has now been entered upon is belittled, and it has been said that it is only about the middle sector. The LAC clarification was not entered into during all these years. I wrote to my distinguished counterpart, the Chinese Foreign Minister, Tang Jiaxuan, that we must try and settle it by the middle of 2002; we engaged ourselves in these tasks. We have exchanged maps. For the first time ever, India and the People's Republic of China have, between them, a security dialogue. For the first time ever, the People's Republic of China now says, this security dialogue has to have elements of strategic component in it. Have we ever failed in pointing out our concerns then? No; we have pointed it out. Notwithstanding that, the continued supply of weapons, missiles and other assistances to Pakistan is a matter of direct and great worry to us. Consistently, the People's Republic of China has said, "Whatever we are supplying to Pakistan is in accordance with the international law." That is their way of saying, "What we are doing is within the four corners of the international law". I am not satisfied; and this provision of missiles and other equipments to Pakistan is a matter of worry. It is not as if we have remained silent. We have addressed our concern, but moved forward, and that is how we will continue to do so. It was a

factual error to say that we have done nothing about international terrorism. I think, the U.N. Security Council Resolutions 1333 and 1363, which relate to imposition of sanctions against the Taliban regime, are a direct consequence of it, because the Resolution 1333 was, in fact, a resolution proposed by Russia, America and India. The hon. Members also mentioned that we have done nothing about Afghanistan. It is, again, factually, not correct. The Northern Alliance is not led by Rashid Dostum, but it is led by President Burhanuddin Rabbani. And it is the Government of President Burhanuddin Rabbani that India recognises. And, having recognised the Government of Burhanuddin Rabbani who, actually, is the President of Northern Alliance, for Members to suggest that Rashid Dostum is heading and, actually, Ahmad Shah Masood only in a part of the Panchsher runs counter to all the facts.

In fact, it is there on ground for every one to see. After that, you suggest that even while I was on the tarmac, the hijackers were permitted to go! In fact, one of the agreements was that the hijackers would not be permitted to leave Kabul; they would not be permitted to stay in Afghanistan. But there was a violation of this. You said that I shook hands; yes, I did; I went there because there were 177 Indians who had been inside that aircraft for the last seven days. The hon. Members have, perhaps, forgotten how the families of those hijacked were then on the roads of Delhi. Please!

Sir, there is one aspect which engaged the attention of a number of hon. Members. It relates to what the Group of Ministers report says about Madarsas. I had assumed, Sir, that the hon. Members would have seen the full report. Yes, Sir, on page 12, at para 2.29, there is a reference where it says that there are reports of systematic indoctrination; that the reports are detrimental to country's communal harmony, which is exactly what we are saying. But the more important reference to Madarsas, which is also in the report -- and I am very sorry to say that even my gallant colleague and friend; we were cadets together. May I, Sir, read out this particular paragraph on page 93. It is Para No.5.134. It says, "Madarsa education is a part of Muslim child's religious tradition. Steps should be taken to encourage these institutions to add inputs on modern education also. Efforts should be made for providing increased facilities for modern education, particularly for border areas where such facilities are lacking. The Ministry of Human Resource Development is presently administering a Central Sector scheme for giving financial assistance for modernisation of

Madarsa education. The scheme should be strengthened and greater publicity given to it. For bringing Madarsas into the main stream with the benefits of modern education system, the State Government should provide support for free supply of text books up to the primary school level, training of Madarsa teachers in teaching of mathematics, science and Urdu and other languages etc., a Central Advisory Board may be set up for Madarsa education, instead of leaving this critical matter to different State Level Advisory Boards and, thereafter, the Ministry of HRD should take necessary action in this regard". I found it necessary to quote because this puts all doubts to rest in regard to Government's intention. I am very grateful for your consideration and generosity of time. I have attempted to answer all the questions...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, ...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: May I conclude? And, therefore, while concluding, I do wish to re-express my gratitude to all the hon. Members. ...(*Interruptions*)... If this has not sufficed and, I am sure, if hon. Members wish to discuss any particular aspects of what I have said, whether it is border management or internal security or defence, in subsequent sessions of the House, I will certainly respond.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, some factual statements have been made by the hon. Minister whereby the hon. Minister is vaguely suggesting that most of the statements that have been made in this House are without any factual basis. About a minute ago, he said that as far as Ahmad Shah Dostum was concerned, he was not part of the Northern Alliance. I am quoting. It is not something that I said myself. It is an article titled 'India's National Security Strategy in Nuclear Environment', written by Gurmeet Kanwal, a research fellow of IDSA. It is not me. I quoted what he had said. ...(*Interruptions*)... One second. (*Interruptions*) Please. If you don't mind. ...(*Interruptions*)... I quote what he said. ...(*Interruptions*)... One second. ...(*Interruptions*)... Please, if you don't mind. This is unfair. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन (उत्तर प्रदेश) : इससे क्या फर्क पड़ता है ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, it is unfair. For one-and-a-half-hours, we were sitting quietly. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will answer it. Don't get agitated. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: We don't understand your intentions. Live up to the standard of the debate. ...*(Interruptions)*...

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI) in the Chair]

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: We have absolutely no doubt about the knowledge of the hon. Minister, and we are candid enough to say that we in Opposition are, perhaps, not that knowledgeable. But we do, when we stand here, make statements with some sense of responsibility, and we expect the hon. Minister, in response, with an equal sense of responsibility, to take our statement seriously. The Minister just now said that as far as Panchsheer Valley is concerned, Ahmed Shah Masood is nothing with the Panchsheer Valley. I quote from this article. I quote, not myself, but Gurmeet Kanwar, Research Fellow, IDSA, saying, "Ahmed Shah Masood is still holding out in the Panchsheer Valley. Abdul Rashid Dostam, Northern Alliance, propped up by tacit support from Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan." This is the statement that I made yesterday, and for the Minister to suggest that I made this statement without a sense of responsibility is to show that the hon. Minister does not have the kind of respect that he ought to show to the Members of this House.

Another statement that the hon. Minister made... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD (Bihar) : That is the problem. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Please be brief.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Will you let me continue? I did not interrupt... *(Interruptions)* I will be very brief.

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL (Uttar Pradesh): You said that 70 per cent budget... ...*(Interruptions)*... That was a very irresponsible statement.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Yes, I am going to show that. The hon. Minister further said that as far as the 75 per cent expenditure is concerned, again, the statement has been made without any basis. I quote here the website, a *Indiadefencebudget2000.com.* of 26th August, 2001. This is not something that I have cooked up. This is what the site says. "Seventy-five per cent of India's Defence Budget is spent on pay and allowances, training, welfare and exercise." That is precisely what I said. Then, "Research and

development accounts for 5.3 per cent of overall allocation. The expected expenditure on pension itself is greater than the total Naval Budget*. Now, these are statements made on the Defence Budget website. We don't make statements without any sense of.. ...*(Interruptions)*... No, I must make my position clear, in this regard. ...*(Interruptions)*... On what basis can anybody make a statement, except on the basis of information that is supplied to us?

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं व्यवस्था की बात उठाना चाहता हूं **...(व्यवधान)...** क्या वैबसाइट के आधार पर हम निर्णय लेंगे? कपिल जी, वह इन्फॉरमेशन आप बताइए सही है क्या **...(व्यवधान)...**

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: If you don't mind...*(Interruptions)*... The Defence Ministry does not have a website which by itself gives us the total allocation in respect of expenditure in the Defence services. Naturally, we have to rely on information from other sources. We don't state that information on our own. ...*(Interruptions)*... One second.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): The reports of the Standing Committee are there. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: The third statement...

श्री राजू परमार (गुजरात) : सुन लीजिए, सही बात सुन लीजिए **...(व्यवधान)...**

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : सही कैसे है? वैबसाइट की बात सही कैसे है? मंत्री जी ने जो बयान दिया, वह सही है।

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Yet another statement was made by the hon. Minister that we are not aware of the percentage of Defence expenditure qua the GDP, and I want to correct the hon. Minister. The statement that I made in this House was that in 1990, the ratio was 2.8 per cent to the GDP; and in 1998, when this Government came to power, it was only 2.2 per cent. Now, the hon. Minister, through a process of jugglery, by averaging out, is trying to suggest that the expenditure now is more. Instead of refuting what I had said -- what I said is entirely correct.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Kapilji, please be brief.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I am giving only point-wise. The fourth

statement that the hon. Minister has made is, this website is from Russia. I made it clear that I was not aware of the fact till I actually hit upon the website. We translated it and I quoted from that website. The hon. Minister should have said, "obviously, the website is wrong." But, for the hon. Minister to say seriously, "This is being done by us without doing adequate work" is to suggest that we, as Members of Parliament, don't do our homework when we come to this House. I think, this comment of the hon. Minister is extremely unfortunate. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, we sat till 8.30 p.m. yesterday. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Sir, I want to again correct the record, and I would like to put the record straight. I made the statement on commitment made by this Government on defence expenditure. I myself had said that these commitments were over a period of ten years. I didn't say that this money was going to be spent the next day. The hon. Foreign Minister suggested, in his response, as if I had said that this money was to be spent the next day. I do expect the Minister--all Ministers of the Government, when they respond--to exercise a kind of restraint that they are supposed to exercise as Ministers of this Government, and show respect to the hon. Members of this House.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, I will restrict myself to only one point. Actually, a lot of heat was generated in this House yesterday evening on, "While we dealt with different kinds of extremist elements, what should be the approach of the Government towards organisations like Bajrang Dal?" A number of hon. Members pointed out that one of the major aspects of national security was to ensure the unity of our people across religious divisions. But we found in the one-and-a-half-hour long speech of the hon. Minister, this issue has not been properly dealt with. The issue has been raised by a number of hon. Members, including General Roy Chowdhury.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH (Assam) : Mr.Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is now well established that there are important lacunae in our system of intelligence gathering as also in the systems of surveillance. The Group of Ministers has gone into this area, but I find that most of the sections relating to intelligence have been kept away from publication. There may be valid reasons for that, and I am not questioning the judgment of the Government. But I would like to ask the hon. Defence Minister that in view of the great anxiety in the country about the adequacy of our intelligence

arrangements, would he make an arrangement where important leaders of the Opposition are apprised of the measures that have been effectively taken by this Government to plug the various weaknesses that have come to its notice with regard to the functioning of our intelligence agencies? This is my first point.

Secondly, the hon. Minister has also talked about the integration of Armed Forces into the Ministry of Defence. He has mentioned that this process is underway. I do recognise that this would require amendments of various rules of procedure and other formalities. But I would like to know from the Defence Minister, when the time comes, when the end product is ready, would he share that knowledge with this House, as to what exactly has been done in order to change the systems and procedures? Or, is it something which will be a confidential document? I would like to have an answer from the hon. Minister to this point.

My third point relates to what the hon. Minister has said about the *madarsa* education. He himself would have noticed that there is great anger, there is great anguish, about the particular passages that appeared in the Group of Ministers' report. The Minister has tried to restore balance, saying that this Government's plan is to provide reasonable facilities for encouragement of modern system of education in the *Madarsas* together with religious education. That process has been going on for the last 7-8 years. It was started when our Government was in office. But I do submit to the hon. Minister that those passages, to which my esteemed colleague, Mr. Rahman Khan took objection, are liable to be misunderstood. I think such a well-meaning person like Gen. Roy Chowdhury could not resist coming to the conclusion that those passages were really very offensive. Would the Government make amends with regard to that paragraph? I would like to know that from the hon. Minister. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI AIMADUDDIN AHMED KHAN (DURRU) (Rajasthan) : Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I will be very brief. My senior colleague, Dr. Manmohan Singh, has already mentioned the apprehension about the *Madarsas*. I can confess I have not read the report. But I would just like to bring to the kind attention of the hon. Minister -- although he probably does not directly deal with this Department -- to a news report published yesterday in *The Hindustan Times* with headlines, "Border *Madarsas* are a menace" This is what the IB says. I will mention only the first sentence, which says, "Will a ban on teaching of Arabic in India's border areas makes Muslims there less

prone to pan-Islamic influences? A recent IB study thinks so." I would like to mention here that this is an infringement on fundamental rights of Muslims because the Quran is a word of God, as far as we are concerned. It is in Arabic and it has to be studied in Arabic. The Quran in any other language is just a reference to it. I would like a clarification from the hon. Minister whether there is such a report by the IB and whether they think so. What is the Government's view on this?

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला खान आज़मी (झारखंड) : शुक्रिया साहब। ग्रुप ऑफ मिनिस्टर्स की रिपोर्ट पर हमारे डिफेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब और साथ ही साथ वजीरे खारजा साहब ने बहुत तफसील से गुफ्तगू फरमायी है। उसमें मदरसों का भी जिक्र आया है और मदरसों को जिस अच्छे तरीके से उनका मुस्तकबिल रोशन करने के लिए गवर्नमेंट ने प्रोग्राम बनाया है और जितनी बातें हमने उनकी जुबान से सुनी हैं वे सारी बातें हमारे लिए संतोषजनक हैं। साथ ही साथ हम उनसे सिर्फ इतनी बात जानना चाहेंगे और मदरसों के बारे में कुछ बताना भी चाहेंगे, चूंकि मदरसों से हमारी तालीम अव्वल से आखिर तक हुई है। सर, मदरसों में जो तालीम होती है, तालीम के दो पहलू हैं, मैं गवर्नमेंट की पूरी तवज्जो चाहूंगा और अपने मिनिस्टर साहब की खुसूसी तवज्जो चाहूंगा, मदरसों में इस्लामी दरसियात के लिए दो निशाब हैं। एक को दरस-ए-आलिया कहते हैं और दूसरे को दरस-ए-निजामिया कहते हैं। जो दरस-ए-आलिया है वह तो गवर्नमेंट से मुतल्लिक है। जैसे - आलिम, फाजिल की जितनी तालीम होती है वह इलाहाबाद बोर्ड से होती है उत्तर प्रदेश में और मदरसा बोर्ड से होती है बिहार में। इसी तरह से अलग-अलग...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : आपका प्रश्न क्या है?

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला खान आज़मी : सर, मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि उन मदरसों में जो कुछ पढ़ाया जाता है वह कुरान है, हदीस है और मुसलमान अपनी रोजमर्रा की जिन्दगी में किस तरह से अपनी जिन्दगी को गुजारें, कैसे पाकसाफ रहें, कैसे समाज के साथ अपना ताल्लुक पैदा करें, यह तालीम बेसिकली उसमें होती है। दुनियावी तालीम मदरसों में नहीं होती। अब वजारती काउन्सिल का यह कहना है कि दुनियावी तालमी को भी हम उसके साथ जोड़ेंगे, यह बहुत अच्छी बात है। मैं कहना यह चाहता हूं, पूछना यह चाहता हूं कि मुझे सुनने को यह मिला है कि इस रिपोर्ट में यह बातें भी लिखी गयी हैं कि इन मदरसे इस्लामिया से हिन्दुस्तान में कम्युनल हारमोनी को ठेस पहुंच सकती है और यह देश के लिए खतरा बन सकते हैं। अगर ऐसी कोई बात है और मदरसों ने ऐसा कुछ किया है तो हम यह चाहेंगे कि वह चीज मंजर-ए-आम पर आनी चाहिए। ताकि ऐसे मदरसों को सजा दी जा सके और अगर मदरसों ने ऐसा नहीं किया है, अगर मदरसों के खिलाफ एक साजिश हो रही है और मदरसों के खिलाफ बार-बार प्रोपेगैंडा किया जा रहा है तो इसे हम मुसलमानों की तौहीन समझते हैं। हम चाहेंगे कि इस प्रोपेगैंडा का मिनिस्टर साहब खंडन करें और मुसलमानों की सलाहियत पर और उनके मदरसों पर जिस तरह शक के बादल जबर्दस्ती डाले जाते हैं, उनको वह छांटने की बात इस हाउस मे कर दें तो मुसलमान मुल्क का मुतमईन होगा। यही मेरी आपसे गुजारिश है। धन्यवाद।

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN (Karnataka): Sir, yesterday, I raised two important points. The first point is: There is a systematic campaign against the *Madarsas*. The press is also highlighting it. The electronic media is also highlighting it. But the truth is not what is being highlighted. I asked whether the Government would consider taking the Muslim Members of Parliament into confidence and share -- the hon. Leader of the Opposition has also raised this point -- with them the information about the *Madarsas* that are engaging in such activities. We would also urge the members of the community, because it is also our responsibility that such things should not happen.

The second point I suggested was to take the well-meaning religious leadership of this country into confidence and share with them your anguish. If the ISI is using the *Madarsas*, it is condemnable. We should all join together in assisting the Government against the ISI using the *Madarsas* for their activities. So, please take...

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : महोदय, मदरसों के लिए अगर चर्चा करा दी जाए तो बेहतर होगा। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री के.रहमान खान : हम बोल रहे हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**... आप हर वक्त यही बहस करते हैं। जब भी कोई बात होती है तो आप बीच में उठते हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Please take your seat.

श्री के.रहमान खान : एक अच्छी बात सुनने के लिए भी आपके पास वक्त नहीं है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI KHAN GHUFRAN ZAHIDI (Uttar Pradesh) : We are ready कहां कहां पर आई.एस.आई. पल रहा है, We will let them know.

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला खान आज़मी : मैं आपकी राय से बिल्कुल इत्तेफाक करता हूं। अगर मदरसों पर ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, let me complete. I will not take more time...*(Interruptions)*...I am only giving a suggestion to the hon. Minister because...*(Interruptions)*...

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला खान आज़मी : हमें खुशी होगी। ...**(व्यवधान)**... इन मदरसों ने देश की आज़ादी की बात की है। ...**(व्यवधान)**... उन्होंने काले पानी की सजाएं खाई हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री के.रहमान खान : मैं यह सजेशन दे रहा हूं कि आप हमारे रीलीजियस लीडर्स को, जो वैल मीनिंग हैं, जिनको मुल्क की फिक्र है, उन्हें बुलाइए। हमें भी मुल्क की फिक्र है और हम चाहते हैं कि रीलीजियस लीडरशिप से आप लोगों को बुलाइए। हम 40-50 मुस्लिम मैंबर्स ऑफ पार्लियामेंट हैं। क्या यह हमारी रिसपॉंसिबिलिटी नहीं है? आप हमें बुलाइए। आपकी जो प्रॉब्लम्स हैं, वह हमारे साथ डिसकस कीजिए। हम आपका साथ देंगे। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : आप कनक्लूड करने दीजिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**... श्री राजीव शुक्ल और श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद ...**(व्यवधान)**... आप बोलना चाहते हैं? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

डा. महेश चन्द्र शर्मा (राजस्थान) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने उनको बुलाया। ...**(व्यवधान)**... वह खड़े भी हो गये हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : मैंने उनका नाम नहीं लिया। मैंने कहा है कि राजीव शुक्ल और रवि शंकर प्रसाद - दो और लोगों के नाम आए हैं, अगर वह बोलना चाहते हैं तो ठीक है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

डा. महेश चन्द्र शर्मा : अगर इस पर बहस होनी है तो हम उसका स्वागत करेंगे लेकिन एक बार पूरी डिसकशन हो गयी, उसका पूरा जवाब हो गया और फिर उतना ही फिर से कहें तो आखिर क्या होना चाहिए? क्लैरीफिकेशंस का मतलब क्या है? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला खान आज़मी : किया गया है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

डा. महेश चन्द्र शर्मा : वह बोलेंगे। उनको बोलने का मौका ...**(व्यवधान)**...

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला खान आज़मी : अगर कुछ ऐसा है तो ...**(व्यवधान)**...

डा. महेश चन्द्र शर्मा : आपकी बात ठीक है। मंत्री जी इस चीज़ को स्पष्ट कर देंगे। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राजीव शुक्ल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जो बात राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा से जुड़ी हुई है, वह अंडर वर्ल्ड माफिया को लेकर है। मैं मंत्री जी को इस बात की बधाई देना चाहता हूं कि जब पाकिस्तानी राष्ट्रपति आए थे तो उन्होंने अंडर वर्ल्ड के सिलसिले में भी उनसे बात की थी लेकिन पूरा जाल पूरे वर्ल्ड में फैला हुआ है और यह बढ़ता ही जा रहा है। चाहे जिस धर्म से भी जुड़े हुए गिरोह हों लेकिन उनका जाल बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। दिल्ली में बैठकर हम लोगों को अहसास नहीं होता है किन्तु मुम्बई में फिल्म इंडस्ट्री थर-थर कांप रही है। वहां बड़े-बड़े स्टार्स को धमकियां आ रही हैं, ऐसी ऐसी बातें होती हैं कि वे लोग डरे हुए हैं

लेकिन हमको उसका अनुभव इसलिए नहीं होता क्योंकि यहां किसी को धमकी नहीं आती वरना उनका तो जीना मुहाल हो गया है। इसलिए मैं मंत्री जी से चाहूंगा कि अंडर वर्ल्ड पर भी अगर कुछ रोशनी डाल सकें तो अच्छा होगा। जब तक भारत सरकार - यह महाराष्ट्र सरकार के बस में नहीं है, किसी भी राज्य सरकार के बस में नहीं है, वहां की पुलिस कुछ नहीं कर सकती - अगर सैंट्रल एजेंसीज़ मिलकर कुछ करेंगी, तो ही इसका कुछ निदान होगा। धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : मंत्री जी, आप बोलिए।

श्री मोहम्मद आज़म खान : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या आप हमसे खफा हैं? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : मैंने उन्हें बुला लिया है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री जसवंत सिंह : सभी माननीय सदस्यों ने स्पष्टीकरण मांगे हैं और संक्षेप में ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री मोहम्मद आज़म खान : आपकी सारी तवज्जो उधर ही है क्योंकि आप उधर के हैं ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : ऐसी बात नहीं है। आप आरोप मत लगाइए। आप सबसे आखिरी में खड़े हुए हैं। पहले जिन्होंने अनुमति मांगी है, सबको समय दिया गया है।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I will try to very briefly address all the queries as well as I can. It is not at all my suggestion that hon. Member, Shri Kapil Sibal, can be charged with absence of preparation. His preparation is assiduous, and it has never been my suggestion that he did not prepare enough. He has gone into certain facts about percentages, etc., that I cited a certain percentage, that I juggled with figures. I don't juggle with figures. Then, he said that he had based his figures on a website. All these figures are available in the Budget papers, under the Demands for Grants for the Ministry of Defence, and also in the reports of the Standing Committee. These are all well examined. On the question of Northern Alliance, it was my suggestion that certain article had been cited of the IDSA. I had been the Chairman of the IDSA. It is, again, purely a coincidence that I do happen to be the Chairman, and I do also know what writings take place. So far as the question of Rasheed Dostan, as a Member of the Northern Alliance, is concerned, Rasheed Dostan had been a Member, he had gone out of alliance, he had sought shelter in Turkey, he had come back again. I don't want to go into all that Rasheed Dostan has done. And, it is not as if Ahmad Shah Masood is confined only to

Panchsher Valley. Ahmad Masood is renowned for what he has done, and he continues to do so. But the Northern Alliance is led by President; Rabbani. It is President Rabbani's Government that accepts what they all the time say. No doubt, the hon. Member is very knowledgeable, extremely well-prepared. And, I would like to publicly say that you are very well prepared, you are very knowledgeable. Please set your mind at rest in that regard. ...*(Interruptions)*... So far as ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, I had a query from Mr. Basu relating to his anxiety, which some other Members had also voiced in relation to Bajrang Dal. Be assured that your anxiety and your views about Bajrang Dal have been well communicated to my distinguished colleague, the Union Home Minister, because his Ministry directly deals with it. रहमान साहब ने फरमाया **...(व्यवधान)...** मैं जवाब ही तो दे रहा हूं। **...(व्यवधान)...**

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: But you are replying on his behalf. We want a complete assurance from you because one of the Members said...*(Interruptions)*... there is nothing wrong in the armed training of the Bajrang Dal Groups. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री जसवंत सिंह : मैं टाल नहीं रहा हूं।...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: We want an assurance from your side. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री जसवंत सिंह : तशरीफ रखिए। **...(व्यवधान)...**

श्री के.रहमान खान : आपको सुनना चाहिए **...(व्यवधान)...**

श्री जसवंत सिंह : तशरीफ रखिए। **...(व्यवधान)...** ओबैदुल्ला साहब, रहमान साहब, आपने और प्रतिपक्ष के नेता माननीय मनमोहन सिंह जी ने जो मदरसों की बात कही है, I can assure you that the Government is fully seized of it. This particular paragraph that I read out and quoted extensively, was only because, in case, it had missed the attention of hon. Members.... It is the very part of the report of the Group of Ministers. Now, hon. Members have said that notwithstanding what was contained in the introductory part. The reports of this kind result in tensions of communal harmony. If objection is found to that, be assured the Government will address itself to that objection. रहमान साहब ने फरमाया कि साहब एक तो ... मैं हिन्दी में बात कहूं तो चलेगी? रहमान साहब ने फरमाया कि साहब एक तो जो रिलीजियस लीडर्स हैं उनको बुलाकर बात कीजिए। दूसरे जो मैम्बरान पार्लियामेंट हैं, उनके साथ बैठकर, मदरसों में जो तालीम दी जाती है उस पर बात

करने में आपको क्या दिक्कत है। अगर किसी मदरसे में गलत काम हो रहा हो तो हमको बताइए। हमसे जो हो सकेगा, हम आपको सही सलाह देंगे। रहमान साहब और आप दोनों को मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूं,...। जहां तक रिलीजियस हेड्स का सवाल है माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी ने कुछ चुनिंदा शख्सियतों को ही बुलाया, पार्लियामेंट सेशन के दौरान बुलाया था। यह संभव नहीं था कि सभी रिलीजियस हेड्स को बुलाया जाए। बुलाना चाहिए तथा उनसे और गुफ्तगु होनी चाहिए, definitely. The Government should sit and discuss with the hon. Members of Parliament, in this regard, without any doubt. It must sit. I will communicate this to the hon. Home Minister. This is an eminently sound suggestion and it should be considered, but there are also other fora and methods of doing so; they should also be utilised. For example, the Consultative Committee of the Ministry of Home, the Standing Committee on Home, these venues are part of the extension, but in addition to these venues, specifically and specially, Members of Parliament subscribing to the noble faith of Islam should be called so that they could sit and discuss this. Why not? It is a very good idea and should be done. अखबार में जो छपा है उसे लेकर मुझसे सफाई मांगी है। मैं माफी चाहता हूं कि मैंने अखबार की वह रिपोर्ट नहीं देखी है। अगले दिन मैंने कहा था कि यह जरूरी नहीं है कि उसकी वजह से यह चीज हुई है ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री ख़ान गुफ़रान ज़ाहिदी : जब मुल्क के सारे मुसलमानों के लिए एक साथ कोई बात कही जाती है तो लीडर ऑफ दि हाउस से हम यह उम्मीद करते हैं कि प्रैस में जो कुछ आ रहा है उससे एक गलत मैसेज जा रहा है। इसे छोड़, क्योंकि ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : आप भी बोल दीजिए ...**(व्यवधान)**...

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला ख़ान आज़मी : मैं सिर्फ इतना पूछना चाहता हूं कि ग्रुप की जो रिपोर्ट आई है उसमें कहीं यह दर्शाया गया है कि मदरसों की वजह से देश की कम्युनल हार्मनी को खतरा जाहिर हो सकता है। जैसा कि मुझे मालूम हुआ है ...**(व्यवधान)**... मैं आपसे सिर्फ इतना पूछना चाहूंगा ...**(व्यवधान)**... मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि चाहे मदरसा हो, मंदिर हो, मस्जिद हो उग्रवादी कहीं भी छुप सकता है, देश का दुश्मन कहीं भी छुप सकता है, ये सारी चीजें कहीं से भी हो सकती हैं लेकिन देश की सुरक्षा और रक्षा पर किसी के साथ, किसी तरह का कोई समझौता नहीं किया जाएगा। अगर उग्रवादी ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री मोहम्मद आज़म ख़ान : प्वाइंट पर बोलिए ...**(व्यवधान)**...

मौलाना ओबैदुल्ला ख़ान आज़मी : हां, मैं वही बात कहने जा रहा हूं कि क्या इस तरह की कोई रिपोर्ट आई है कि किसी मदरसे का आई.एस.आई. से कोई ताल्लुक है या किसी मदरसे में ऐसी तालीम दी जाती है जो देश की कम्युनल हार्मनी को खतरा पैदा करे? अगर इस तरह की बात है तो गंभीर बात है और यह बात सरकार के मंजरेआम पर आनी चाहिए। अगर इस तरह की बात नहीं है तो मैं समझता हूं कि मदरसों के खिलाफ खुल्लमखुल्ला प्रोपेगैंडा हो रहे हैं और मुसलमानों की शक्ल उसी तरह से बिगाड़ी जा रही है जो किसी जमाने में सिक्ख भाइयों की बिगाड़ी जा रही थी। मुसलमानों के साथ इस तरह का बर्ताव किया जाना उनके साथ नाइंसाफी है और हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमानों के साथ ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री राजू परमार : सिक्योरिटी पर बोलने दो ...**(व्यवधान)**...

एक माननीय सदस्य : अखबार में जो छपा है गलत छपा है लेकिन अगर यह सही है तो मैं चाहता हूं कि आप इसे क्लेरिफाई करें ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री भारतेन्दु प्रकाश सिंहल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैंने "आजतक" में देखा था कि दो कश्मीरी तालिबे इल्म से माइक पर पूछा गया कि तुम्हें स्कूल में क्या सिखाया जाता है तो उसने कहा कि हमें यह सिखाया जाता है कि यह जमीन हमारी है, देश हमारा है और हमारे इस देश पर हिन्दुस्तान जबरिया कब्जा किए हुए है। यह मैंने "आजतक" में देखा था और दूसरी चीज देखी थी बॉर्डर एरिया के बारे में ...**(व्यवधान)**... मैं यह बता रहा हूं, गलतफहमियां भी हो सकती हैं, गलत बोल सकते हैं ...**(व्यवधान)**... मैं कोई क्लेरिफिकेशन नहीं दे रहा हूं मैं तो केवल इतना बता रहा हूं ...**(व्यवधान)**...

सरदार गुरुचरण सिंह तोहड़ा (पंजाब) : आपने उस वक्त सुना होगा ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I will address myself to the issue that has been raised by Shri Khan. जनाब, आपने जो इजहारे खयाल फरमाया, ये सारे खयालात होम मिनिस्टर साहब को पहुंचाए जाएंगे In addition to the issue of *Madarsas*, two issues have been raised by the Leader of the Opposition. One is related to Intelligence. In the Group of Minister's Report, in the Chapter on Intelligence, broad conclusions are there, but, notwithstanding the broad conclusions, what the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said is, "the corrective steps that you take, in an appropriate manner, should be shared with the Leadership of the Opposition." Yes, Sir. Yes; this should be shared. I will convey this to the Prime Minister, and I have no doubt that he shall do so also. The second thing is, this integration of the Services Headquarters with the Ministry of Defence. They were, up till now -- as you would understand, being a distinguished civil servant in your earlier incarnation -- attached offices. Now, they are no longer attached offices. That is the significant difference. It is imminent now, Sir, because the totality of all that is to be done is all approved; the Cabinet Secretary is in the process of finalising the necessary Government orders, etc. Certainly, Sir, if you desire, I will be ready to come back again to Parliament and discuss this afresh. I do believe that I have, to the best of my ability, answered all the questions; and I am very grateful to Pranab Babu for having initiated the discussion, and to all the hon. Members who have participated in this discussion. आपने जो अंडर वर्ल्ड का पूछा उसके बारे में मैं ज्यादा वाकिफ नहीं हूं। उसके बारे में कह नहीं सकता I am very grateful to you, Sir. Thank you.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : सदन की कार्यवाही दोपहर के भोजन के लिए 2.30 बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-seven minutes past one of the clock

The House reassembled after lunch at thirtythree minutes past two of the clock

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAMA SHANKER KAUSHIK) in the Chair.]

THE ENERGY CONSERVATION BILL, 2001

DR. A.R. KIDWAI (Delhi): Sir, this is a very important Bill, because electricity, in the modern life, represents not only the way of life, but also our entire development of agriculture, industry and society depends on electrical energy. Therefore, it is high-time that we gave importance to the conservation of the energy resources, especially in the field of electricity.

The Bill, today we have, is for the conservation. This is a subject in which the consumer himself is interested, because he has to pay for the high charges caused by the wastage of energy. The Government would do well to reduce wastage and to conserve electricity. It must ensure that the appliances which are used are made according to specifications required for the least consumption of energy. Sometimes, cheap varieties of electrical appliances are available. They consume a lot of energy. We not only lose energy, but the consumer has to pay. So, the first important thing which has not been given much importance in this Bill is to ensure that all electrical appliances which are manufactured are efficient; and conservation of energy is assured. They should also be properly tested.

The other important aspect is that we must educate our children and our people, right from the school age, that they should use energy where it is absolutely necessary, put it off when it is not required. This has to be done. I have seen in the offices sometimes. Even our officers and peons have to be trained when to use the light and fans and when to put them off. These are some of the very important aspects of conservation.

But I have some doubts about this Bill. In the name of conservation of energy, the consumers can be harassed by the staff of the Electricity Boards. In the process, some of them try to make extra money. Therefore, a kind of discipline is required among the staff to deal with consumers. They